

It is **FURTHER ORDERED** that a status conference with counsel is scheduled for **May 20, 2021**, at 10:00 a.m. Plaintiff's counsel shall provide the Court and opposing counsel with conference bridge details (such as a telephone number and access code) no later than May 13, 2021.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ John M. Gallagher
JOHN M. GALLAGHER
United States District Court Judge

First, judicial economy will be promoted by a stay. Defendant's motion for summary judgment challenges plaintiff's Article III standing to bring this suit. *See* ECF No. 57, at 3. Without taking a position on the merits of defendant's argument, a determination on this issue could resolve the entire case, including eliminating the need for class-related discovery. As such, this factor weighs in favor of a stay.

Second, the balance of harm to the parties supports staying this action. Defendant argues that continuing with class discovery will be expensive, and that cost may be proven to be completely unnecessary in the event its motion is granted. *See id.* at 5. At the same time, the Court recognizes the plaintiff's concern that a stay will interfere with her ability "to expeditiously pursue her claims." ECF No. 59, at 2. Considering the plaintiff has already been able to conduct a significant amount of discovery and the stay will be limited to a ninety-day period, the Court finds that the balance of harms weighs in favor of a stay.

Third, the length of the stay is not indefinite. Although the defendant requests that the stay last until the motion for summary judgment is decided, the Court will limit the length of the stay to a definite period of time, namely ninety days. Such a limited scope in the delay of this litigation weighs in favor of a stay.

Accordingly, the Court finds that a short stay is prudent in this matter.